DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 532 CS 508 762

AUTHOR Flores, Norma Landa

TITLE Using Collaborative Strategies To Validate the Intercultural ACCESS Test: Assessment of Communication Competency & English Speaking Skills.

PUB DATE 21 Nov 94

NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (80th, New Orleans, LA, November 19-22, 1994).

PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Biculturalism; Bilingualism; *Communication Skills; Cooperation; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Speech Communication; *Student Evaluation; *Test Validity

IDENTIFIERS *Communication Competencies; *Golden West College CA; La Raza

ABSTRACT

A crucial consideration in the development of equal representation in the academic, work, and civic life of the United States involves shifting away from the assumption that the traditional speech communication student is monocultural and that research methods must fit linear models of assessing teaching and learning communication competencies. "La Raza" researchers can use a variety of collaborative strategies to counter this assumption. A Chicana communication researcher's proposed revision of a speech course at Golden West College (GWC), California, which includes the in-class administration of the Intercultural Assessment of Communication Competency and English Speaking Skills (I ACCESS), was challenged by campus administrators in charge of matriculation. To gather data to validate the I ACCESS instrument at GWC, the researcher is using "community building" strategies, while the Speech Communication Department at GWC is conducting a series of workshops to review methods used in assessing communication competency and oral competency of students. Portions of the I ACCESS test are being incorporated into core course assessment forms. In the spirit of collaboration, changes are being made to existing assessment forms. By focusing on macrolinguistic rather than microlinguistic elements of encoding, the researcher shifts her strategy to a multicultural/intercultural research paradigm. Her department is working with a consultant to establish entry level oral communication expectations and to measure exit-level proficiency. Another strategy is to ask other speech educators to pilot-test I ACCESS and to pursue funding for local and state sources. Appendixes present the I ACCESS test, three revised skill assessment forms, and a list of competencies expected of students. (Contains 17 references). (Author/RS)

ED 377 532

Using Collaboration Strategies to Validate the Intercultural ACCESS Test: Assessment of Communication Competency & English Speaking Skills

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Flores

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Norma Landa Flores
Golden West College, Huntington Beach, CA.

Presented on the Panel
Building Community Through La Raza Research Methods:
A Roundtable Discussion With Audience Participation

Speech Communication Association Convention
New Orleans, Louisiana November 19-22, 1994

CS508762

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

A crucial consideration in the development of equal representation in the academic, work and civic life of the United States involves shifting away from the assumption that the traditional speech communication student is monocultural and that research methods must fit linear models of assessing teaching and learning communication competencies. This paper will describe the strategies La Raza researchers can use to design, test and validate intercultural communication competency assessment in spite of institutionalized resistance and/or intolerance to "special treatment" for bilingual or bicultural students.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM

The problem, from the point of view of California State University, Long Beach Chicano Studies Professor and Orange County Los Amigos (Golden West College/MEChA) Conflict Investigation Committee member, Jose Lopez, is that " there is a move across the country to take over ethnic minority student activities and institutionalize them in order to divert funds earmarked for groups such as MEChA by **denying them what the institutions consider to be, *special treatment*** "(J. Lopez, 1994).

DEFINING STUDENT EQUITY

The issue of providing student equity for underrepresented students at Golden West College was addressed in a memo evaluating the area of access to the college by comparing the campus percentage of ethnicity with that of the community. Demographics on Ethnicity for Fall 1992 indicate that Hispanics made up 9.7% (1,479) of GWC total enrollment of 15,295 and that the 1990 Census data reported the percentage of Hispanics in the Coast Community College District (of which GWC is a member) as 20.6% for Hispanics age 18 and over plus 32.2 % of Hispanics in the 1990 population of those persons under the age of 18. The A.A. Degree And Certificates Ethnicity Report for 1991-92 shows that 5.74%, 39 Hispanics out of 679 non-Hispanic graduates received a degree from Golden West College (N. Kidder, 1993). These

figures indicate that there is a lack of equity in the areas of access and graduation of Hispanic students at Golden West College (L.A. Lopez, 1993).

According to a G.W.C. President's Cabinet directive, a Student Equity Committee was established on March 10, 1993 in order to develop a Student Equity Plan to better coordinate planning, programs and funding in order to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of existing resources. The plan must specifically address historically underrepresented students such as Hispanics' degree of access and success and place an emphasis on the following elements:

1. Campus-Based Research or Needs Assessment,
2. Goal Identification,
3. Implementation of Activities,
4. Identification of Resources and Funding,
5. Evaluation (R. Drew, 1993).

LA RAZA RESEARCH METHODS CALLED "REVERSE DISCRIMINATION"

In addressing the first elements, Campus-Based Research or Needs and Goal Identification, campus administrators in charge of matriculation, which includes maximizing the efficiency of its seven components of: admissions, orientation, assessment, counseling/advisement, student folllow-up, research and evaluation, and coordination and training, appeared before the GWC Committee on Curriculum and Instruction (CCI) to challenge this Chicana researcher's course revision of Speech Communication 115, Bicultural Academic Success Communication Skills. The proposed revision included the in-class administration of the I ACCESS, Intercultural Assessment of Communication Competency & English Speaking Skills (Appendix A). The revision included methods of providing bicultural students with an opportunity to communicate successfully in a college environment in assessment/enrollment contexts, library/student services/ tutoring contexts, and in contexts focusing on methods of maintaining relationships in bi-

cultural academic, interpersonal, public speaking, and problem-solving group communication.

The proposed course revision further stated that interactions will focus on methods speakers and listeners can use to share each other's cultural perceptions of differences and similarities in order to include those who feel they are at risk of not succeeding in the classroom due to their (1) use of English as a second language (2) underrepresented racial, ethnic, gender, age status (3) underrepresented socio-economic, physically challenged, etc. status (N.Flores, 1993).

Members of the CCI said that the author of the course revisions hadn't based the materials and curriculum on sufficient theory and that the I ACCESS needed to be approved by the State of California's Community College Chancellor's Office. The Committee felt that administration of the I ACCESS as a measure of oral communication proficiency for the purposes of entry level placement, course intervention, and exit level placement recommendation would be the same as setting up prerequisites and that "procedures needed to be set down for students to challenge the prerequisites because of an action M.A.L.D.E.F. , the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, had brought against the State of California for setting up entry level pre-requisites tending to discriminate against historically underprepared students. The result of M.A.L.D.E.F.'s charges is that now California Colleges endorse the policy of giving Chicanos what they figured Chicanos asked for, the right to fail ..." (W. Bryan, 1994).

Furthermore, the GWC Committee on Curriculum and Instruction stated that, "There seems to be some division of opinion among subject area experts on the pedagogy of this course. CCI is not prepared to decide these issues. Until these procedures are completed, CCI doesn't feel comfortable including new advisories and prerequisites on new or revised courses" (G. Stratton, 1994). There are three full time speech communication "area experts" in the GWC Speech Communication Department. I've been attempting to use my La Raza "Community-Building" strategies to gather data to validate the I ACCESS instrument at GWC, by collaborating with Wesley Bryan, the Department Chair and President of the Academic Senate. He understands

that some of the dominant culture "old timers" see my bicultural teaching methods as a threat to the status-quo and as evidence of reverse discrimination because it acknowledges the possibility of adapting to bilingual/bicultural students' bicognitive learning styles. This is what seems to be "***special treatment***" to them and they feel it is not equitable to monocultural students or Hispanic students who are willing to assimilate before they come to college . Thus, Chicanas or Chicanos using bicultural research methods are regarded with suspicion and said to be practicing reversed discrimination to further their own "special" interests.

ASSESSING CULTURALLY DIVERSE ORAL COMMUNICATION, RHETORICALLY

The Golden West College Speech Communication Department is currently conducting a series of Speech Proficiency Workshops in order to review methods used in assessing communication competency and oral competency skills of students assessed in the Speech Communication Lab. Students enrolled in (1) Sp Com 025, Speaking and Listening Skills for Non-Native Speakers of English, (2) Sp Com 110, Basic Principles of Speech Communication and, (3) Sp Com 100, Interpersonal Communication, are required to go to the Speech Lab to demonstrate their oral communication competency skills while they interact with a partner and are assessed by a student trained to assess the skills in the Sp Com 240, Leadership and Supervisory Communication Skills class. Sp Com 240 students use criterion-referenced assessment forms to evaluate the dyads and to give them oral feedback about their communication interactions.

Since Sp Com 100, Interpersonal Communication, is the course students must take as part of the requirements for earning an A. A. degree from Golden West College, we offer twenty two sections of Sp Com 100. Students in Sp Com 100 must demonstrate seven skills in the Lab. The first issue discussed in the first Speech Proficiency Workshop was whether there was a need to revise all seven skills by adding criterion-referenced measures of the interactants' orally communicated messages. The present assessment forms focus on observing and providing

feedback about an interpersonal communication chain of behaviors accomplished such as, describing observed behavior, describing probable assumptions, making open-ended requests, using owned language (Appendix B). The proposed revision would keep the communication behaviors necessary for competency in maintaining relationships, and would add assessment measures of the speaker's spoken language skills such as, facilitating the other's understanding of spoken vocabulary, pronunciation, and nonverbal congruency (Appendix C).

As can be seen in the I ACCESS instrument (Appendix A) Competencies Four:Vocabulary/ Grammar, Five:Pronunciation/Emphasis and, Six:Nonverbal Congruency, with their attendant Criteria, are the crucial features that measure the oral/rhetorical human interactions of***what*** and ***how*** culturally diverse persons speak to each other. Competencies One:Purpose/Focus, Two:Organization, Three:Examples and, Seven:Time measure the ***when*** and ***how much*** culturally similar persons speak to each other. In all types of intercultural communication settings ranging from bicultural, cross-cultural, multicultural , inter-racial, intercultural, to international there is a distinct possibility of incompetent oral communication and non-sharing of intended meanings due to a lack of assessment and intervention strategies speech communication educators may use to facilitate their students' total communication interactions.

INFUSING OTHERS WITH LA RAZA PARTICIPANT'S DICHOS Y HECHOS

Chicanas speak Spanish. Spanish influences our rhetorical behaviors. In Spanish, "dichos" means "sayings or proverbs" and "hechos" means "acts or behaviors." I have been trying to build community with my office mate, Wes Bryan. Wes spent three years on sabbatical in Spain. His wife and children speak Spanish. I tutor him on the semantics of "dichos" as part of La Raza collaboration strategy. Right now we are working on, "mas vale una gota que sique que un charco que para." Roughly translated, this means that a drop that continues to drip is more valuable than a sudden gush that stops. So we are going to try to infuse portions of the I ACCESS

test into our core classes' assessment forms over a continuing period of time and let the data collect in a pool for us to call upon in evaluating the Department's offerings and the success of our underrepresented and underprepared students.

The controversy is twofold. One of the three members of the Speech Department feels that interpersonal communication is not a matter of pronunciation or oral production, and that speech students should be demonstrating the competency of understanding the theory. Since oral delivery is a part of public speaking and not interpersonal communication, the question becomes " Are we mixing apples and oranges?" The second controversy is that if we do use portions of the I ACCESS to assess spoken language skills as an integral part of interpersonal communication competency, we may be violating the "students' right to fail," by discriminating against them when we use an assessment instrument that has not been validated or approved by the State of California Community College Chancellor's office. Since the assessment of spoken language proficiency has traditionally been done in the area of English as a Second Language, the question follows, " Can we and should we use an ESL test for speech communication purposes?"

If the debate that took place between three speech communication colleagues , in order to find an answer to our twofold dilemma, is any indication of the apprehension our field finds itself in when assessing speech students in multicultural situations, it seems to me that debating is not a practical approach to meaningful oral communication assessment. The time has come to conduct a pilot test using multiple variables that will provide us with the answers that will validate or disprove all or portions of the I ACCESS test. In the spirit of collaboration, I have changed the prototype revised Lab Skill#2:Clarifying Perceptions (Appendix D). Notice that Purpose number 5, which formerly stated students must demonstrate the ability to check perceptions by: "Facilitating the other's understanding of spoken *vocabulary, pronunciation,* and nonverbal congruency," no longer includes the words *vocabulary, pronunciation,* but have been replaced by the word *English* ." Also, under the heading:Demonstration of Spoken Language

Skills, notice that skills number 3 and 4 dealing with pronunciation criteria have been dropped and that skill 2 does not include the words *pronounce* or *words*. Skill 2 is more general and now states "I speak English clearly enough to share my meaning with others."

By focusing on the macrolinguistic, not microlinguistic elements of encoding, my strategy shifts to a multicultural/intercultural research paradigm. The responses obtained from the participants measure the degree of proficiency of what La Raza participants want to say in order to share their meaning with multiculturally/interculturally different others. Both La Raza speakers and multiculturally/interculturally different listeners become co-recoders of a newly shared meaning. In observing and recording the culturally unique features of oral communication, La Raza researchers obtain valuable behavioral descriptions to enhance the participants repertoire of oral communication code-switching strategies in order to transcend possible multiucultural/intercultural oral message misunderstandings. These " participant-originated " behavioral descriptions may then be used as criteria to measure speech proficiency and assessment instrument validation. My La Raza strategy is to use this transcendance of what La Raza participants want to say to others, and to start infusing the status quo "others" with the multiculturally/interculturally unique features that are crucial in validating the I ACCESS.

It is expected that this La Raza research paradigm shift will serve to empower both encoding and decoding participants in multicultural/intercultural oral communication transactions, by providing them with knowledge to take ownership of their speaking and listening skills. Another outcome may be that I may start viewing my role as researcher from that of " Producer of knowledge to co-producer of knowledge," (D.V.Tannno & F.E. Jandt, 1994). Furthermore, I will be able to see and hear not only with my researcher's eyes, but with the eyes and ears of those whose shared lifestyle defines the appropriateness of the communication strategies used in *their* situation. These additional variables may provide assessment data on student success when tracked by ethnicity,language and oral communication proficiency, and course completion.

This in turn, fits into the concept of using multiple measures in validating assessment instruments and accesses us to the services of our campus Research and Assessment Officer, Dr. Steve Isonio. Dr. Isonio was formerly employed by the Los Angeles Unified School District's Office of Bilingual Education as a Psychometric Consultant and has experience in bicultural cognitive learning styles and has recognized the fact that the I ACCESS is a viable tool to assess bilingual/bicultural oral communication skills. He has recently been given the new assignment of using his research skills to conduct a Campus Climate Study as part of the GWC Student Equity Program and the Academic Senate President has appointed me to serve as a member of the committee. SCA's Associate Director, Roy Berko has informed Dr. Isonio of my participation in the SCA's Summer Conference on College Assessment and has promised to send him a copy of the Conference Proceedings.

I have been working with Dr. Isonio on the development of the I ACCESS instrument for over two years when we tried to administer the test in a manner similar to the SPEAK test prepared by the Educational Testing Services. He felt that we needed more criterion-referenced measures because, as Don Juan, a Yaqui Indian explained to Chicano Professor, Carlos Castaneda, " The truth falls somewhere between the cracks of the facts". La Raza research relies on a sharing of multiple perceptions. In this case it seems to be time consuming, but we remember the words of another Chicano leader, Emiliano Zapata, "La lucha sique, the struggle continues!" Our lucha continues as the Speech Communication Department consults with Steve Isonio in an effort to establish entry level oral communication expectations to serve as the standard to measure exit level speech communication oral proficiency through the use of an unbiased instrument. Wes Bryan has combined the Minimal Speaking and Listening Competencies adopted by the California Community Colleges Board (W. Bryan, M. Edelstein, S. Petit, E. Lewis, A. Esparza (1984)

and the Recommendations For Speaking and Listening Skills adopted and endorsed by the Speech Communication Association (R.E. Bassett, N.Whittington and A. Staton-Spicer, 1978) to develop a statement of what the Goldenwest College Speech Communication Department expects entry level students to be able to do (Appendix E). Steve Isonio will design measures of entry and exit degrees of proficiency or self-report of communication apprehension to meet the Department's needs. La Raza research strategies will be used by asking the "other", the entry level speech student, to report his/her own communication uniqueness and resources and asssigning some form of "weighted" numbering system to indicate exit level success in comparison to entry level of proficiency. This proposed self-report form will serve two purposes. First, it will be used as an orientation tool before a course of instruction begins. Second, it will be used as an early alert intervention tool to advise students of appropriate level of course placement and recommend concurrent enrollment and/or tutoring services to enable entry level students to benefit from oral communication instruction and classroom interaction. Steve Isonio has prepared a list of agencies and institutions to contact in order to ask for grants to fund our efforts to establish a uniform coding system to measure entry and exit speaking and listening skills of multicultural/intercultural students through the I ACCESS test.

BUILDING COMMUNITY WITH LOS AMIGOS OF ORANGE COUNTY, SCA & CSCA

In addressing the fourth element, Identification of Resources and Funding, the campus administrator's policy became one of divide and conquer the Chicano/Mexicano/Latino Spanish surname students, by developing and supporting the Independent Latino Students Association, (ILSA) in order to weaken the Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan's (MEChA) demands for representation in campus recruitment, assessment, curriculum design, counseling, retention, and graduation matters that affect Chicano students. In the Spring of 1993 a Hispanic high school student recruitment event, historically run by MEChA, was taken over by the college

administration after GWC MEChA students had had several meetings motivating Chicanos to stay in school and prepare themselves for college. MEChA students boycotted the administration's event and because of that,MEChA leaders and advisors were suspended from active participation in campus activities based upon a false allegation that alcohol was present at a MEChA dance held shortly after the boycott action (D. Froomkin & J. Collins, 1994). I had served as the substitute faculty advisor at the MEChA dance in question and my suspension from serving as advisor for any and all campus clubs and activities along with the suspension of MEChA leadership and participation in campus activities was found to be , "possible capriciousness on the part of the Golden West College Administrators, and at worst, some decision and treatment bordering on racism" (E. Zuniga, J.E. Lopez, L. Williams, 1994) by the Orange County Los Amigos GWC-MEChA Conflict Investigation Committee.

A member of that committee contacted me and advised me to bring the possible violation of affirmative action by virtue of discriminatory acts of exclusion of my research methods to the attention of the college president and the school Districts's Director of Human Resources and Personnel. In preparation for that meeting with the president, I requested and received a letter from SCA's Associate Director, Roy Berko acknowledging my work and participation in the Summer Conference on College Assessment. I have received encouragement and support from La Raza Caucus member, Dr. Adelina Gomez as well as from our fellow I ACCESS instrument developer, Dr. Sam Riccillo, who has written up a proposal for a Title V Grant to validate the instrument. Los Amigos, it turns out, is not only in Orange County California. Adelina, Sam and I have a Colorado background. Sam knows my family from Pueblo, Colorado and has worked hard to help speech students with their bilingual-bicultural language acquisition skills. Los Amigos, means " The Friends" in Spanish. This is the main La Raza research strategy I use in asking other speech educators to pilot-test the instrument and send their data to my friends, Adelina Gomez at the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs and Sam Riccillo at the University of

Texas at El Paso.

A final, but vital link in La Raza research methodology is to secure the support of friends and allies at their individual State level. The largest amount of funding for educational purposes comes from local and state taxes. The educational dollars that facilitate grants to pilot test instruments such as the I ACCESS can be won through lobbying efforts by a united group of speech communication professionals. The California Speech Communication Association, CSCA has been interested in matters dealing with oral language assessment and multicultural oral communication education for many years. At a recent meeting of its Executive Board , the CSCA Planning Committee decided to ask Sharon Ratliffe and this Chicana researcher to share the information and experiences we gained from the SCA Assessment Conference held in August, 1994, as the major presentation at the annual meeting of the CSCA to be held in April, 1995.

Sharon Ratliffe will be the keynote speaker at the Eastern Communication Association at that time, so she has asked me to provide the CSCA with a "wonderful review of the SCA Assessment Conference,"(S.Ratliffe,1994). The time and format of my presentation is up to me. I have been instructed to plan my presentation "to suit yourself and what you feel would be of most benefit to our members," (E. Stoll, 1994) Orale!, that's a Chicana term for, this is the time! I plan to review the four instruments discussed at the SCA Conference and described in the proceedings. I'll save the I ACCESS for the last. I'll prepare my presentation in a motivational outline format while participants use the instrument to assess a monocultural speaker and an intercultural speaker to experience the total oral/rhetorical, cost-efficient and student equitability features that are built into the I ACCESS test. In the Action Step of Alan Monroe's well proven process, I'll warrant my claim that the CSCA should help me write for grants to find the funds to pilot test the I ACCESS because it perpetuates my speech colleagues' jobs, it adapts to their audience, multicultural students and it's what CSCA's founder would have us do when he advised me that I would gain Chicano speech empowerment allies by letting my non-Chicano friends help me,

"If anyone ever asks you if you know me, just say,yes he's my friend, or as I hope you'll always be proud to say, es mi amigo," (J. McBath, 1991).

CONCLUSION

In summary, there are 20.6% Hispanics age 18 and over residing within the Golden West College community, yet only 9.7% of the institution's total enrollment consists of Hispanics and of those only 5.74%, 39 Hispanics out of 679 non-Hispanic graduates received a degree from Golden West College in 1993. M.E.Ch.A students, Chicano education researchers, and Chicano community rights activists believe there is a move across the country to take over ethnic minority student activities such as participation in Chicano student recruitment, assessment, curriculum development and retention intervention strategies. They believe that institutions want the funds that accompany identification of Chicanos needs, but they don't want to give Chicanos any special programs that would divert the funds away from the majority students' or the institution's general budgeting needs. This paper presented a method of using collaboration strategies to validate the I ACCESS instrument in order to facilitate a shifting away from the assumption that bilingual and bicultural students' oral communication skills must be assessed with linear (culturally similar) models of assessment rather than with oral/rhetorical (culturally diverse) models of assessment. In collaborating to validate the I ACCESS test, benefit can be derived for Golden West College Chicano students,the Golden West College Speech Communication Department, California Community College Academic Senates charged with the task of promoting Student Equity, the California Community College Chancellor's Office charged with validating tests, the CSCA dedicated to improving multicultural oral communication education in California and, the SCA considered the "seal of approval" on all matters of speech communication research, education, training and information for academic as well as business and governmental institutions needing to assess the "other's" oral skills.

References

Bassett, R.E., Whittington, N. and Staton-Spicer, A. (1978) "Recommendations For Speaking And Listening Skills", The Basics in Speaking and Listening for High School Graduates:What Should Be Assessed? Communication Education, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 293-303.

Bryan, J.W. (1994) Using Speech Assessments For Advisory Placement Recommendations, Golden West College Speech Department Speech Proficiency Workshop No. 2, Golden West College, Huntington Beach, CA., September 29, 1994.

Bryan, J.W., M. Edelstein, S. Petit, E. Lewis and A. Esparza (1984) Resolution Proposing Intersegmental Adoption of Minimal Speaking and Listening Competencies Expected of High School Graduates, Resolution Regarding Minimal Competencies Speaking And Listening Fall Conference 1984, Office of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA.

Drew, R. E.(1993) Introduction To Using The Student Equity Reference/Resource Guide, Golden West College Student Equity Committee Notebook, Office of the Administrative Dean of Instruction, Golden West College, Huntington Beach, CA.

Flores, N.L. (1993) Speech Communication 115, Bicultural Academic Success Communication Skills, Golden West College Course Outline:Advisory Recommendation Revision , presented to the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction, Golden West College, Huntington Beach, CA. March 1, 1994.

Flores, N.L. (1994) Intercultural Assessment of Communication Competency & English Speaking Skills, I ACCESS Test & Users Manual, paper presented at the SCA Summer Conference on Assessment, Alexandria, VA. August 4-7, 1994.

Flores, N.L. and Ratliffe, S.A.(1994) How To Develop a Competency-Based, Speech Communication Laboratory Assessment Program,paper presented at the SCA Summer Conference on Assessment, Alexandria, VA. August 4-7, 1994.

Froomkin, D. and Collins, J. (1994, Sept. 2) Four Students Held In College Sit-In:Police In Riot Gear Swarm Over Golden West College in Huntington Beach to Quell a Campus Protest, The Orange County Register, Metro: Education Section, pp. 1 &4, Orange County, CA.

Kidder, N. (1993) Student Equity Demographics, Memo to Golden West College Academic Senate, Office of the Administrative Dean of Student Services, Golden West College, Huntington Beach

References

Lopez, J. (1994) M.E.Ch.A Is Being Denied,What Institutions Consider To Be, "Special" Treatment, Report of Orange County Los Amigos M.E.Ch.A-GWC Conflict Findings, telephone interview/conversation with J. Lopez from Placentia, CA. August 17, 1994 at 10:03 p.m.

Lopez, L.A. (1993, Spring) The Inequities Of Financial Aid For Chicanos At GWC, in: Letters to SPECTRUM, SPECTRUM, a publication of the Intercultural Center and Intercultural Affairs Committee, Golden West College, Huntington Beach, CA., p.7.

McBath, J. (1991) On Developing CSCA Strategies for Latino Oral Communication Efforts, Ad Hoc Committee Meeting to Develop Train the Oral Communication Trainers Programs With CSCA Participation, La Mirada, CA.

Ratliffe, S.A. (1994, Sept. 29) Letter Recommending Norma Flores to Make SCA Assessment Conference Presentation, Correspondence Copy, Office of the Director of Staff Development, Golden West College,Huntington Beach, CA.

Stoll, E. (1994, Sept. 26) Letter Inviting Sharon Ratliffe and Norma Flores to Share SCA Assessment Conference Information with the CSCA, Correspondence, Office of the Chair of the Speech Communication Department, De Anza College, Cupertino, CA.

Stratton, G. (1994) CCI Doesn't Feel Comfortable About New Advisories and Prerequisites, Recommendation About Proposed Speech Communication 115 Course Revision, Office of the Chair of the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction, Golden West College, Huntington Beach, CA.

Tannno, D.V. and Jandt, F.E. (1994) Redifining the "other" in multicultural research, The Howard Journal of Communications, Vol. 5, Nos. 1 & 2, pp. 36-45.

Zuniga, E., Lopez, J., and Williams, L. (1994) Recommendations, Orange County Los Amigos GWC-M.E.CH.A Conflict Investigation Committee, Orange County, CA.

Intercultural Assessment of Communication Competency & English Speaking Skills

Appendix A

Examinee's Last Name:_____ Examinee's First Name:_____ I.D.# _____

Examiner: Look at the communication interactions on this page so that you can notice the various processes people use to do their work-related tasks in their culturally diverse job situations.

Examinee's responses may be written in the space below:

Examiner: Make believe that you are at a job interview about the kind of work that interests you and answer the following questions about your kind of work.

Examiner Q: What kind of work do you know how to do that might involve you in a culturally diverse situation?

Examiner Q: What kind of actions or procedures would you have to use in order to get your job done safely and effectively?

Examiner Q: Why do you think that your way of getting the job done will be beneficial to all of the people involved in the culturally diverse job situation?

15A

Competencies & Criteria

One:	Two:	Three:	Four:	Five:	Six:	Seven:
(Purpose/Focus)	(Organization)	(Examples)	(Vocabulary/Grammar)	(Pronunciation/Emphasis)	(Nonverbal Congruency)	(Use of Time Allotted)
__Paraphrases Other's Purp.	__Previews Bhvrs.	__Reports Chron. Behvrs.	__Speaks English	__Is Audibe/Encodes	__Gives Oral Responses	__Avoids Pauses
__Highlights Other's Idea	__Uses Transitions	__Describes Context Cond.	__Is Accurate/Precise	__Uses Standard Vowel	to Aural Prompts	__Avoids Extensive
__Discloses Qualifications	__Gives Specifics	__Defines Tech. Terms	in Linking Words and	and Consonant Sounds	__Clarifies Attitude	Non-Pertinent Responses
__Responds to Question	__Highlights Instr.	__Reports Other's Percep.	Phrases to Questions	__Explicitly Articulates	Corresponding with	__Avoids Abruptness
__Focuses On Directions	__Summarizes	__Gives Own Opinion	__Uses Continuity	Word Endings	Visual Prompts	__Avoids Fallacious
			__Gives Vivid Details	__Conveys Meaning of	__Discloses Cul. Percep.	Reasoning Process
			Relevant to Other	Emphasized Syllables	__Reinforces Cul. Value	__Sufficiently Balances Use of
			__Avoids Vague Terms	__Communicates Message	__Avoids Distractive	Time for Each Response in
				Function and Intention	Verbal/Nonverbal Bhvr	Relation to Mutual Purposes
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5

5 criteria x 7 competencies=35 points

exp: 35 8=27/7=3.85%=Proficient

Total possible points=35-___=___/7___score

Rating Scale: 5=Effective 4=Proficient 3=Functional 2=At Risk 1=Restricted

I ACCESS c by Norma Landa Flores, 1994 Department of Speech Communication, Golden West College, Huntington Beach, CA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Skill #2:Clarifying Perceptions

Name_____**Instructor**_____**Class(Hr/Day)**_____

Purpose: To demonstrate the ability to check perceptions by:

1. Describing observed behavior.
2. Describing probable assumptions about the observed behavior to demonstrate flexible thinking.
3. Making an open-ended request for feedback.
4. Using owned language.

Mastery:

__1. I begin by identifying the topic I want to discuss with my partner.
__2. I describe an instance of my partner's behavior (something my partner has said or done).
__3. I state 2 different probable assumptions I am making about my partner's behavior.
__4. I make an objective and open-ended request for feedback about the accuracy of my observations and assumptions.
__5. I close the conversation by restating my partner's response to clarify my understanding, and I express support or appreciation.
__6. I consistently use owned language.

Satisfactory:

__1. I begin by identifying the topic I want to discuss with my partner.
__2. I describe an instance of my partner's behavior.
__3. I state 1 probable assumption I am making about my partner's behavior.
__4. I make an objective and open-ended request for feedback about the accuracy of my observations and assumptions.
__5. I close the conversation by restating my partner's response to clarify my understanding.
__6. I used owned language no more than 1 time.

Needs To Be Repeated:

__1. I do not begin by identifying the topic I want to discuss with my partner.
__2. I do not report an example of my partner's behavior.
__3. I do not state an assumption I am making about this behavior.
__4. I do not request feedback from my partner or I use a closed or leading question to request feedback.
__5. I do not close the conversation by summarizing or do not express support or appreciation.
__6. I use disowned language 2 or more times.

Comments:

___Mastery
___Satisfactory
___Repeat

STAFF SIGNATURE_____

Skill#2:Clarifying Perceptions

Name_____**Instructor**_____**Class(Hr/Day)**_____

Purpose: To demonstrate the ability to check perceptions by:

1. Describing observed behavior.
2. Describing probable assumptions about the observed behavior to demonstrate flexible thinking.
3. Making an open-ended request for feedback.
4. Using owned language.
5. Facilitating the other's understanding of spoken vocabulary, pronunciation , and nonverbal congruency.

Demonstration of Communication Skills

yes no

__ __1. I begin by identifying the topic I want to discuss with my partner.
__ __2. I describe an instance of my partner's behavior (something my partner has said or done).
__ __3. I state 2 different probable assumptions I am making about my partner's behavior.
__ __4. I make an objective and open-ended request for feedback about the accuracy of my observations and assumptions.
__ __5. I close the conversation by restating my partner's response to clarify my understanding, and I express support or appreciation (share similar perception).
__ __6. I consistently use owned language.

Demonstration of Spoken Language Skills

yes no

__ __1. I use non-offensive language that is free of over-generalization, jargon, or bias.
__ __2. I speak & pronounce English words clearly enough to share my meaning with others.
__ __3. I explicitly add the endings to the words I pronounce (" Helped " not " Hell ").
__ __4. I stress syllables to convey appropriate meanings (" Personal" not "Personnel").
__ __5. I avoid distractive nonverbal behavior (sighing, shrugging, slouching, fidgeting, not looking at partner, excessive giggling, and/or shouting).
__ __6. I balance my use of time for each response in relation to the purpose of this skill.

Comments:

__**Mastery**=6 Com Skills +4 Spoken Skills

__**Satisfactory**=3 Com Skills +3 Spoken Skills

__**Repeat**=0 Com Skills+2 Spoken Skills **Staff Signature**_____

Skill#2:Clarifying Perceptions

Appendix D

Name_____**Instructor**_____**Class(Hr/Day)**_____

Purpose: To demonstrate the ability to check perceptions by:

1. Describing observed behavior.
2. Describing probable assumptions about the observed behavior to demonstrate flexible thinking.
3. Making an open-ended request for feedback.
4. Using owned language.
5. Facilitating the other's understanding of spoken English, and nonverbal congruency.

Demonstration of Communication Skills

yes no

__ __1. I begin by identifying the topic I want to discuss with my partner.
__ __2. I describe an instance of my partner's behavior (something my partner has said or done).
__ __3. I state 2 different probable assumptions I am making about my partner's behavior.
__ __4. I make an objective and open-ended request for feedback about the accuracy of my observations and assumptions.
__ __5. I close the conversation by restating my partner's response to clarify my understanding, and I express support or appreciation (share similar perception).
__ __6. I consistently use owned language.

Demonstration of Spoken Language Skills

yes no

__ __1. I use non-offensive language that is free of over-generalization, jargon, or bias.
__ __2. I speak English words clearly enough to share my meaning with other.
__ __3. I avoid distractive nonverbal behavior (sighing, shrugging, slouching, fidgeting, not looking at partner, excessive giggling, and/or shouting).
__ __4. I balance my use of time for each response in relation to the purpose of this skill.

Comments:

__**Mastery**=6 Com Skills +4 Spoken Skills

__**Satisfactory**=5 Com Skills +3 Spoken Skills

__ **Repeat**=0-4 Com Skills+2 Spoken Skills **Staff Signature**_____

revised 9/30/94 N.L.Flores

Minimal Speaking, Listening, and Oral Communication Competencies Expected of Golden West College Students

(First Draft Developed by Wes Bryan for GWC Speech Proficiency Workshop Number 3)

At point of entry the student should be able to demonstrate the ability to:

1. **Listen effectively** to spoken English by

   Understanding directions given orally by a classroom instructor for class assignments;

   Understanding material presented in a class lecture;

   Understanding enough details of a classroom discussion to correctly identify or summarize main ideas of discussions;

   Understanding enough spoken English to paraphrase the main ideas, with the use of notes, of a lecture or of a classroom discussion.

2. **Use words, pronunciation and grammar** appropriate for classroom participation by

   Using language understood by instructor and class members;

   Using words, pronunciation, and grammar to convey ideas clearly;

   Speaking with sufficient volume, rate, and clarity to be heard in classroom situations.

3. Speak English with enoungh **verbal proficiency** to participate in class activities by

   Using spoken English to obtain information about how to complete an assignment;

   Making an oral report on a class-related topic which can be understood by classmates;

   Spontaneously expressing and supporting own view in a class discussion or answering questions from other students about own report given;

   Using spoken English to answer an instructor's or classmates question about own classroom performance;

   Using spoken English well enough to answer to a question based on a class lecture;

   Using spoken English well enough to ask questions regarding class requirements, assignments, and to clarify information presented in class.

THE ACADEMIC SENATE

For California Community Colleges

RESOLUTION REGARDING MINIMAL COMPETENCIES FOR SPEAKING AND LISTENING

FALL CONFERENCE 1984

Resolution Proposing Intersegmental Adoption of Minimal Speaking and Listening Competencies Expected of High School Graduate

(W. Bryan, Golden West; M. Edelstein, Palomar; S. Petit, San Mateo; E. Lewis, Canada; A. Esparza, San Jose)

Whereas the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Basic Skills made the following recommendations in October 1979:

Students seeking the Associate Degree or the Certificate of Completion should be required to demonstrate proficiency in oral communication but the required level of proficiency and manner for fulfilling the requirement should be left to each community college district, and

Whereas the College Board specifically identifies the need for high school students to demonstrate competence in six academmic areas, including speaking and listening for which they recommend:

* The ability to engage critically and constructively in the exchange of ideas, particularly during class discussions and conferences with instructors.

* The ability to answer and ask questions coherently and concisely, and to follow spoken directions.

* The ability to identify and comprehend the main and subordinate ideas in lectures and discussions, and to report accurately what others have said.

* The ability to conceive and develop ideas about a topic for the purpose of speaking to a group; to choose and organize related ideas; to present them in Standard English, and to evaluate similar presentations by others.

→ * The ability to vary one's use of spoken language to suit different situations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

At the same time, the Academic Senates of the University, the State University, and the Community Colleges should begin work on developing assessment procedures for their statements of basic competencies to be expected of high school graduates going to college and redefining admissions procedures so as to relate them to competencies.

Whereas The Speech Communication Association has adopted and endorsed a set of recommendations for minimal speaking and listening competencies for high school graduates:

1. COMMUNICATIONS CODES. This set of skills deals with minimal abilities in speaking and understanding spoken English, and using nonverbal signs (e.g., gestures and facial expressions).

   A. Listen effectively to spoken English.
   B. Use words, pronunciation and grammar appropriate for situation.
   C. Use nonverbal signs appropriate for situation.
   D. Use voice effectively.

2. ORAL MESSAGE EVALUATION. This set of skills involves the use of standards of appraisal to make judgements about oral messages and their effects.

   A. Identify main ideas in messages.
   B. Distinguish facts from opinions.
   C. Distinguish between informative and persuasive messages.
   D. Recognize when another does not understand your message.

3. BASIC SPEECH COMMUNICATION SKILLS. This set of skills deals with the process of using message elements and arranging them to produce spoken messages.

   A. Express ideas clearly and concisely.
   B. Express and defend with evidence your point of view.
   C. Organize (order) messages so that others can understand them.
   D. Ask questions to obtain information.
   E. Answer questions effectively.
   F. Give concise and accurate directions.
   G. Summarize messages.

4. HUMAN RELATIONS. This set of skills is used for building and maintaining personal relationships and for resolving conflicts.

   A. Describe another's viewpoint.
   B. Describe differences of opinion.
   C. Express feeling to others.
   D. Perform social rituals.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE